

## **REMARKS**

This paper is filed in response to a Final Office Action dated May 26, 2010 (hereinafter “Office Action”), which rejected all of the pending Claims 1, 8-10, 17-20, 23, 24, 28-33 and 35-105. Claims 38, 39 64-75, are amended.

### **I. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §101**

In the Office Action, Claims 38-39, 64-75, 96-105 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101. The Office Action recommended that the phrase “non-transitory” should be added to the preambles of each of these rejected claims.

In this response, the preambles of Claims 38-39, 64-75, 96-105 are amended to include the phrase “non-transitory” in each of their respective preambles. Thus, the 101 rejection of these claims should now be withdrawn and the are all now in condition for allowance.

### **II. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103**

In the Office Action, claims 1, 8-10, 17-20, 23, 24, 28-33 and 35-105 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Danieli et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,240,093 (hereinafter referred to as “Danieli”), in view of Beuk et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,774,673 (hereinafter referred to as “Beuk”), and to Harvey et al., U.S. Publication No. 2002/0059379 A1 (hereinafter referred to as “Harvey”). However, in view of the amendments to claims 1, 17, 28, 35, 38, 40, 52, 64, 76, 86, and 96, Applicants submit that these rejections are now moot.

Claim 1 teaches “validate the data in the message with a data server”. In contrast, the newly cited Harvey discloses authenticating the source of an invitation message. See [0132]. Clearly, authenticating a source of a message is a substantially different process than the claimed validation of data within a message with a separate data server. Thus, the suggested combination of the Harvey reference with the Danieli and

Beuk references does not cure the deficiencies of the prior art as admitted on Page 6, paragraph 3, of the Office Action. Therefore, Claim 1 is neither suggests or makes obvious an important aspect of the claimed invention.

Additionally, independent Claims 17, 28, 33, 35, 38, 40, 52, 64, 76, 86, and 96 are somewhat similar to independent Claim 1, albeit different, and each is at least allowable for the same reasons as posited herein for independent Claim 1.

Furthermore, since dependent Claims 8-10, 18-20, 23, 24, 29-32 and 36, 37, 39, 41-51, 53-63, 65-75, 77-85, 87-95, 97-105 depend from one of independent Claims 1, 17, 28, 33, 35, 38, 40, 52, 64, 76, 86, and 96, each of these dependent claims are at least allowable for the same reasons as the respective independent claims upon which they depend. Also, since the separate rejections of these dependent claims are now moot in view of the reasons presented for the respective independent claims upon which they depend, a further refutation of those rejections is not provided here. However, the absence of such a further refutation of the rejections of the dependent claims in no way should be construed as an admission of the legitimacy of the rejections, but rather it is in the interest of brevity and expediting the allowance of these claims that a more detailed refutation is not provided at this time.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the above amendment, the applicants' representative believes the pending application is now in condition for allowance.

Dated: July 26, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By /john w branch/

John W. Branch

Registration No.: 41,633

Frommer Lawrence & Haug LLP

745 Fifth Avenue

New York, NY 10151

(206) 336-5690

(212) 588-0500 fax

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant